

In re Appln of Alfredo BENETTI
Appln. No. 10/585,137
Reply to Office Action mailed December 29, 2009
Reply dated March 29, 2010

Applicant respectfully traverses on the basis of the second paragraph of MPEP 803, and Applicant respectfully maintains in this regard that the species are sufficiently similar that the requirement is unwarranted. A complete search of the elected subject matter Species A would encompass the species other than A, so no additional burden would be involved. While the examination of a few additional claims would add some burden, such additional burden would not be a "serious burden."

Applicant further maintains that the requirements of PCT Rules 13.1 and 13.2 are not met because the generic claims themselves serve to link the species and thus set forth a single general inventive concept.

Applicant accordingly respectfully requests withdrawal of the requirement and examination of all the claims on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By



Sheridan Neimark
Registration No. 20,520

SN:ltm
G:\BNA\B\mugv\2010-03-29 election.doc
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528